

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JEWISH LITERATURE IN 1890.

THOSE who have read recent accounts of the literary products of Continental nations, and have seen—notwithstanding the famous Universities, the rich libraries, and other large endowments which are at their disposal for the advancement of learning—how few of the books written during the past year are destined to make a mark in the progress of human intellect, will certainly not expect to meet with signs of any extraordinary advance in the field of rabbinic literature, the study of which is more or less confined to Jews, whose evil fortune it is to be still labouring, in many countries, under difficulties depriving them of both the means and the leisure necessary for the production of great and lasting works. We must, then, be satisfied with the little we have. But even of this little, my account can make no claim to completeness, partly owing to the fact that most of the books which are published in the East were quite inaccessible to me, and partly because even many of those that have reached me belong, in spite of the modern date which their title pages bear, to a class of books which was already obsolete at the beginning of the century. They do not increase our stock of information on a single point, and serve only as a warning example of the uselessness of learning that does not submit to the control of a sound scientific method.

A great dearth is to be noticed this year in the region of *Grammar* and *Lexicography*, and, except the essay of Dr. Barth, to which I shall again have occasion to refer, I have to notice here only the sixth volume of Dr. Kohut's *Aruch Completum*,[1] containing the letters

[1] *Aruch completum* ערוך השלם . . . auctore Nathan filio Jechielis edit. Dr. Alexander Kohut. Tomus Sextus. Viennæ: 1890.

ם, ע, and a part of פ, the philological merits of which, and its usefulness for the student of rabbinic, are now established facts, and need no further recommendation. In the face of this magnificent work, the הגהות הערוך (notes on the *Aruch*), forming a part of the book *Beth Aharon*,[1] by R. Aaron Fuld, become almost superfluous, as the author made no use of MSS., the only means of correcting old texts. The merits, however, of R. Aaron in the field of Jewish literature (best known from his additions to the *Shem Haggedolim*), his devotion to study and philanthropy fully justified his friends in saving for the world everything that issued from his pen. Dr. M. Horovitz's biographical sketch, with which the book is prefaced, gives us many interesting details of this noble life. One could have wished that the writer had not been so petty as to bereave R. Zacharias Frankel of the ז"ל with which he honours those who belong to his own party. One could also wish that Dr. Horovitz would strive after more correctness in his Hebrew style; as it is, we have in it a strange mixture of rabbinical and biblical Hebrew full of all sorts of Germanisms, only to be understood by a German.

A similar scarcity appears in the matter of *Commentaries on the Bible*, of which I have to mention here the following publications. First, the essay of Dr. Neubauer on "The Authorship and the Titles of the Psalms according to early Jewish Authorities,"[2] for which every Biblical student will feel deeply grateful. For by the term "Jewish Authorities" the learned author not only understands the Rabbis, but also the earlier translators of the Bible, whose versions "must be counted as Jewish documents," as well as the comparatively later Rabbinic and Karaite commentators. The latter wrote mostly in Arabic, and the majority of their compositions are only extant in MSS., so that Dr. Neubauer had not only to collect the materials, but also to edit unknown

[1] *Beth Aharon* בית אהרן *R. Aharoni Fuld Responsa atque adnotationes in plerusque Talmud Babylonici, Aruch, Tischbi Meturgeman*, etc. Ediderunt filii auctoris. Frankfurt a. M.: 1890.

[2] Published in the second volume of the *Studia Biblica*. Oxford: 1890.

texts, and to translate them into English. And as "the subject has as yet made inconsiderable progress," the views of these earlier authorities can still be consulted with great profit. This is especially the case, I think, with the headings of the single chapters. Compare, for instance, the most recent commentary (Delitzsch) on the heading of Ps. ix. with the opinions given by Dr. Neubauer in page 40, and it will hardly be found that modern researches have advanced much further in this respect. I have next to note the book *Mayan Gannim*,[1] a commentary on Job, by R. Samuel ben Nissim Masnuth, edited from a Bodleian MS., by Herr Salomon Buber. The worth of Herr Buber's editions of rabbinical works is well known. I would call attention to the fact that the author often mentions the Targum to Job, of which he sometimes gives readings differing from ours (*e.g.*, pp. 7, 9, 15, 48, 72, and elsewhere). It is hardly necessary to remind the readers of this REVIEW that Herr Buber's results as to the date and country of the author have been contested by Dr. Neubauer. R. Saadiah's Arabic Translation of Isaiah, which M. Derenbourg has been giving in a new edition in Stade's *Zeitschrift*,[2] was also brought to an end this year. In the same periodical we have the first part of an excellent essay by Dr. Bacher on R. Solomon Ibn Parchon's Hebrew dictionary מחברת הערוך. The second part will, as it seems, contain variations from MSS. of this dictionary. Of Dr. H. Berger's dissertation on R. Benjamin b. Jehuda, and his commentary to Ezra and Nehemiah,[3] it is premature to speak before the text of this commentary has appeared, which he promises soon to edit from various MSS. But it may already be recommended for the sketch that Dr. Berger gives of the exegetical school in Italy. Dr. Josephsohn's pamphlet on the legends relating to the Wars of the Maccabees has some bearing on the Apocry-

[1] מעין גנים, edited by Solomon Buber, under the auspices of the Jewish Literary Society מקיצי נרדמים. Berlin: 1889.

[2] *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, herausgegeben von D. Bernhard Stade. 1890.

[3] *R. Benjamin b. Jehuda, sein Commentar zu Ezra und Nehemia*, by Dr. Heinrich Berger. Breslau: 1889.

pha of the Old Testament.[1] The suggestion of the author to supply the gap in 2 Maccabees i. 18 by the parallels in Midrashim (p. 17) is worth considering, whilst less satisfactory are the reasons by which he tries to account for the confusion of the feast of Chanukah with that of Tabernacles. Here Geiger's hypothesis (see p. 19), will probably remain the best solution of the problem (cp. also Rapoport's ingenious theory on the שמחת בית השואבה וחנוכה in the *Hashachar*, iv. p. 432 seq.) Herr Weissmann's treatise on "Judith,"[2] is not devoid of some good suggestions towards restoring the lost Hebrew text (p. 18 seq.). Whether, however, it is necessary to alter the text (of xvi. 9) in the face of the phrase המסתכל בעקיבה של אשה, by which the Rabbis meant something less harmless than we understand (see *Nedarim* 20*a*), I leave undecided.

From late commentaries I pass to modern *editions* and *commentaries on ancient Rabbinical works*. Among these there is Dr. Schwartz's new edition of, and commentary on, the first order of the Tossefta,[3] the fourth volume of R. Eisler's *Notes on Rabbinical Language and Archæology*, the greatest part of which deals also with the text of the Tossefta,[4] and a new edition of, and commentary to, the third order of the same work by M. Friedlænder.[5] There can be no doubt that Dr. Schwartz's work is the most important contribution of the year. He thinks that the Tossefta in its present state represents nothing but a chaotic mass of various formations and layers dating from

[1] *Die Sagen über die Kämpfe der Makkabaeer gegen die Syrer nach griechischen und jüdisch-agadischen Quellen*, von Dr. Cæsar Josephsohn. Breslau: 1889.

[2] *Das Buch Judith, Historisch-kritish beleuchtet* von Arthur S. Weissmann. Wien: 1891.

[3] התוספתא לפי סדר המשניות עם פירוש הגיון אריה, or *Tosifta juxta Mischnarum Ordinem Recomposita et Commentaria Instructa* auctore Adolpho Schwarz Rabbino Karlsruhano. Pars I., Ordo Seraim. Vilnae: Typis et sumptibus viduae fratrumque Romm, 1890.

[4] *Beiträge zur RabbinischenSprach- und Alterthumskunde* von Rabb. Leopold Eisler. II. Theil. Wien: 1870. Commissions-Verlag von Ch. D. Lippe, Buchhandlung, II. Praterstrasse 13.

[5] תוספתא סדר נשים avec le commentaire Heschek Schlomoh. Presburg, 1890.

different periods and schools, which, owing to such revolutionary causes as the terrible persecutions of those times as well as to the ignorance and carelessness of the copyists, were thrown together into one shapeles conglomerate, without regard to order or chronology. Dr. Schwartz believes that our Tossefta was completed by the younger contemporaries of R. Jehudah Hannasi with the intention of saving from oblivion that complex of old Halachoth or Aggadoth, which the latter from one reason or another excluded from his official codex of the Mishnah. In this belief, then, he attempts to reconstruct the Tossefta with the aid of the given order of the Mishnah, on which it was based, and to which it was meant to be an *addition* (the literal translation of the word Tossefta). Dr. Schwartz does his work admirably, and the boldness which he shows in transposing whole sections which almost alter the face of the Tossefta will be envied by many a Bible critic. It is true that some of these transpositions admit of a difference of opinion. Compare, for instance, Tossefta *Berachoth*, c. 3 § 9 of our editions, which Dr. Schwartz puts after the section beginning ואיזה הוא, in conformity with the order in the Jerushalmi. But why should not the Tossefta, in this place, agree with the order in the Babli *Berachoth*, 31*a*, which —if we eliminate from it the passage given there in the name of R. Chiya, which is really missing in the MSS. (see Rabbinowitz, Variæ Lectiones)—there is reason to suppose is pretty near to the original text. This agreement is the more probable as the Tossefta has in this place the readings of the Babli, not of the Jerushalmi, which, by the way, ought to be corrected after the parallel in the *Aggadath Shemuel II.* But this minor point shows only how consistent Dr. Schwartz is in carrying out his suppositions. Certainly these suppositions themselves still leave room for discussion. One might ask, granting that the Tossefta was based on the Mishnah, on which Mishnah? For though the hypothesis of Dr. Zuckermandel, according to which the *Tossefta* represents the Halachic code of the Palestinian schools, whilst our *Mishnah* was compiled at a later date in Babylon, did not, as far as we know, find much acceptance

amongst scholars, it is, nevertheless, hardly to be expected that our Mishnah was exempt from the fate which befell all ancient Jewish productions. However, we had better postpone the discussion of this and similar points until Dr. Schwartz furnishes us with the treatise on the origin of the Tossefta, as well as the Boraithoth scattered over both the Talmuds, and their relation to the Mishnah, which he promises in the introduction to his book. Of a less ambitious character is Eisler's undertaking, which confines itself to verbal emendations in the text of the Tossefta. Though the book contains many good points, I am afraid that Eisler is sometimes too hasty in his emendations; perhaps he suffers from want of books. Thus he would hardly have corrected the text in Tossefta *Berachoth* c. vii. 1, if he had read the remarks of A. Krochmal (*Scholien*, p. 91) and Brüll (*Jahrb.* vii. 113) on the same passage. M. Friedlaender pursues the same method as in his commentary on *Seder Zeraim*, and there is nothing fresh to add to the verdict which was pronounced on the author's first production. (See this REVIEW, II., 194.) I might here express a wish that the scholars who devote themselves to the study of the Tossefta would make use of MS. Add. 27,296 in the British Museum, which contains the Tossefta of the whole of the second order (Moed) and tractate Chulin. The variations presented by this codex would probably prove of more critical value than those which are the result of mere guesswork. Considered from this point of view Professor Strack's edition of the Mishnah of the tractate *Sabbath*[1] deserves all praise, the editor having employed for his text all the MSS. and texts available. The glossary at the end will also make it useful for beginners. Lector M. Friedmann's *Hamaschneh*,[2] giving in short paragraphs the contents of all the tractates of the Mishnah, and his *Talmud Baba Mezia*,[3] containing extracts

[1] *Schabbath* . . . herausgegeben von Professor Hermann L. Strack. Leipzig: 1890.

[2] ספר המשנה (der Mishnah-Lehrer) von M. Friedmann. Vienna: 1890.

[3] בבא מציעא Zum Unterrichtsgebrauche von M. Friedmann. Vienna: 1890.

from this tractate, are also calculated to pave the way for the young student who wants to be introduced to the strange world of the Rabbis. All Jewish teachers, I hope, will not be slow to avail themselves of the wide learning and long experience of this famous scholar. Entirely new is the small tractate on Mourning (מסכת שמחות זוטרתי)[1] now edited for the first time from MSS. by Herr Horowitz in the second and third part of his collection of Ancient Boraithoth, extending from p. 28 to p. 40. One feels so grateful for this addition to the Minor Tractates that one can pardon him his long useless introductions and unnecessary glossaries. I may here add that at the head of the list of authorities who quoted this version of שמחות has to be placed the Gaon R. Samuel ben Chofni, as can be seen from his commentary to the Pentateuch (פרשת ויחי), ed. J. Israelsohn, in which three passages are given, which are only to be found in this tractate (28 and 31). R. Joseph Ibn Caspi's quotation ואמרו רבותינו ז"ל לא דברים ממיתים ולא דברים מחיים (see טעם זקנים by Ashkenazi, p. 53), also refers to this tractate. It is to be regretted that Dr. Klotz, in his new critical edition of the tractate *Semachoth*[2] (usually printed together with the other minor tractates), was unable to incorporate this small *Semachoth*, which would have made his work more complete. But the good use the editor has made of almost all the MSS. existing of this tractate—among them, also, of a very valuable MS. belonging to Dr. Adler—and the fulness of his references (see, for instance, p. 17, note 5, and p. 33, note 1), will partly compensate for this defect. The fourth part of Herr Horowitz's collection (פתחי נדה) forms an introduction to the text of the *Boraitha of Niddah*, to be edited in the fifth part of this collection. We must not anticipate our judgment before Herr Horovitz has fulfilled his promise. Of new editions of late Rabbinic works I have to mention here the first part

[1] תוספתא עתיקתא, or *Uralte Tosefta*, 2 und 3. Abtheilung by Chayim M. Horovitz. Mainz: 1890. Ditto, 4. Abtheilung. Frankfurt a. M.: 1890.

[2] Der Talmudische Tractat *Ebel Rabbithi* oder *S'machoth*, nach Handschriften und Parallelstellen bearbeitet, übersetzt, etc., von Dr. Moritz Klotz. Verlag J. Kauffmann.

of the *Machzor Vitri*,[1] emanating from the school of Rashi, edited from a Bodleian MS. by Rabbi S. Hurwitz for the Society Mekize Nirdamim. The editor will probably at the end of the work give us in an appendix a full description of his MS. and its relation to the other MSS. of the *Machzor Vitri* in the British Museum and Paris. Its authorship is also a matter which demands closer examination (see Dr. C. Taylor's remark in a note to the Introduction to his *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*). Dr. Hildesheimer, under the auspices of the same society, continues the Vatican *Halachoth Gedoloth*,[2] of which the second part has now appeared. A very meritorious task was the editing of the Arabic text of "The Letter of Consolation of Maimon ben Joseph"[3] (the father of Maimonides), and its translation into English by Mr. L. M. Simmons, of Manchester. The readers of this periodical had full opportunity to admire the saintliness and simplicity of the author (see especially p. 25, where the commentary to Ps. xc. begins), as well as to appreciate the learning and accuracy of the editor. I have only to add that this letter has now appeared in a pamphlet by itself, with some additional notes and corrections by Mr. Simmons. The "variæ lectiones" to Maimonides' Mishnah Torah,[4] according to a MS. now in the possession of Herr Julius Hamburger, will be cordially welcomed by students of this great code. We do not know whether the description offered of the MS. is trustworthy in all its parts. But even if the date given there (the beginning of the fourteenth century) be correct, we have in English libraries MSS. of this Code of an earlier date, especially in Oxford (see Catalogue, Neubauer, Nos. 538-614), and it would certainly repay the trouble of a student to collate them for the purpose of giving us at last a critical text of this classical work. Nor must I forget to notice

[1] מחזור ויטרי, *Machzor Vitri*, herausgegeben von S. Hurwitz. Berlin: 1889.

[2] הלכות גדולות *Halachoth Gedoloth, nach dem Texte der Handschrift der Vaticana.* Herausgegeben von Dr. Hildesheimer. Berlin: 1889.

[3] Reprinted from the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, Vol. II.

[4] שינוי נוסחאות וגירסאות לספר משנה תורה Frankfurt a. M.: 1. 1889.

here the following contributions to the Rabbinic literature, though they do not exactly fall under the heading of commentaries or editions. Thus Dr. Güdemann has devoted a whole monograph to the verses in Matt. v. 43,[1] and parallels in other parts of the New Testament as well as in the Rabbinic literature. It is, indeed, one of the best things written on the subject. (See Dr. L. Lazarus, *Zur Charakteristik der Talmudischen Ethik*, p. 10, where the literature is fairly put together, to which must be added *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, by Dr. C. Taylor, p. 8, *seq.*) It will have to be carefully read, both by students of the Old Testament and the New Testament. I can only hope to see it soon translated into English. Professor Bloch has given us a new compendium of the Mosaic-Talmudic Laws of Inheritance.[2] The author confines himself mostly to Jewish sources (see, however, p. 10 and p. 49, note 32), in which he is a complete master, and he rectifies Michaelis in some places (see pp. 7 and 8). Dr. Köningsberger's pamphlet on the sources of the Halacha[3] is also worth mentioning on account of the few quotations he gives there from the Midrash Hagadol and other MSS. Whether, however, these MSS. or any MS. still to be discovered can prove the divinity of the Oral Law, and that it is coeval with the Torah itself, against the opinion of the "majority of the modern Jewish historians," is a question which the author would have done better to leave untouched. Such useless polemics—for surely the views of these historians are entirely independent of the existence or non-existence of a Mechilta more or less—ought to be avoided in any work which pretends to scientific treatment. Not unfitly I may mention here the Rev. S. Singer's English version of the prayer-book,[4] not merely because the Jewish liturgy

[1] *Nächstenliebe, ein Beitrag zur Erklärung des Mathæus-Evangeliums* von Dr. M. Güdemann. Wien : 1890.

[2] *Das Mosaisch-Talmudische Erbrecht*, von Prof. Moses Bloch, published in the *B. Programm* of the Rabbinical Seminary in Buda-pest, 1890.

[3] *Die Quellen der Halachah*, von Dr. Königsberger. Berlin: Verlag H. Engel, 1890.

[4] *The authorised Daily Prayer-book*, with a new translation by the Rev. S. Singer. London : 1890.

is in the main a rabbinical production, but also on account of its containing a new translation of the Pirke Aboth. It requires only to take a glance at the older translations of the *Sidur* in this country to see the excellence of Mr. Singer's work, and I can only hope that a second edition will appear soon and meet with the same merited success as the first. Perhaps Mr. Singer will also use the opportunity to correct such trifles as, for instance, to leave out the note to § 15 in Aboth ch. ii. (p. 189). As may be seen from the parallels put together in the *Massecheth Aboth*, etc., by Noah Chayim, of Kabrin (32a), this passage has nothing to do with abusing one's higher gifts. Possibly Mr. Singer will justify his interpretation by a reference to the famous simile in Jerushalmi Chagigah (76*c*), where the Torah is also compared with fire, but in quite another sense. A most ingenious piece of work is the treatise of Dr. Rosenthal on the composition of the Mishnah,[1] whose method strongly recalls that with which we are familiar from the works of modern Bible critics (see, for instance, pp. 36, 87, and 89). By this method he thinks to discover in the Mishnah parts dating from before Hillel, which were composed with an anti-Sadducean tendency. As the author bases his hypothesis on the assumption that Geiger's and Wellhausen's theories on the origin of this sect are mistaken, it still remains to be seen how he will refute them as he promises to do in the second part.

I will now glance at *Bibliography and Biography*, whereby we shall gain some insight into what might still be done in the line of editing. I notice, first, Dr. Kayserling's Bibliographical Dictionary of works concerning Judaism written by Jewish authors in Spanish or Portuguese,[2] including Ladino, a sort of Jewish jargon of these languages. The book is prefaced by an excellent essay on the history and importance of this literature, and the appendix gives a collection of Spanish and Jewish proverbs. The pedigrees

[1] *Ueber den Zusammenhang der Mischna* . . . . von Dr. Ludwig A. Rosenthal. Strassburg: Verlag von K. J. Trübner, 1890.

[2] *Biblioteca Espanola-Portugueza-Judaica.* Par M. Kayserling. Strasbourg, Charles J. Trubner: 1890.

of various Jewish families scattered throughout the book will be found interesting by genealogists, whilst the Catalogue (page 114) of the controversial works by Jewish converts will probably prove useful both to the bibliographer and the historian. However, it could hardly be said that this literature equals either in quantity or quality the Judaica written in the German language (or in Jüdisch-Deutsch) by Jewish authors. Indeed, among the books published during this century I cannot discover in Dr. Kayserling's list a single production of great value, except perhaps the מעם לעז. Of far greater importance is the Catalogue of the MSS. in Herr Halberstam's Library.[1] The name of Halberstam is known far and wide. There is hardly any Jewish scholar of the younger generation who is not under obligations to Herr Halberstam, not merely for his suggestions, but also for the liberality with which he puts his collection of MSS. at the disposal of students. But no one had an adequate idea of the riches of this collection until the appearance of this Catalogue, compiled by Herr Halberstam himself. It is, in truth, the greatest Jewish private library in the world, comprising 411 MSS. Everything which has occupied the Jewish mind — Targum, grammar, Halacha, Hagada, liturgy, philosophy, Kabbalah, poetry, astronomy, history, and medicine—is represented there. From this Catalogue the student can see how much is still left for us to do. Herr Halberstam's collection contains many a treasure still waiting for the explorer to bring to light. Let the reader only glance over the liturgical part, which contains many Piyutim which remained unknown even to the great master Zunz, or at the description of MS. 345, which contains almost more references to the English Rabbis of the pre-expulsion period than all the other sources put together. The Commentaries to the Talmud, some of which are unique, would alone suffice to make this Library famous. However, greatly as I admire Herr Halberstam, who has so far made such excellent use of his collection, I cannot refrain from asking, What will

[1] קהלת שלמה *Catalog hebräischer Handschriften*, von S. J. Halberstam in Bielitz. Vienna: 1890.

become of all these treasures? Experience has taught us that the fate of all private libraries is to be scattered after a generation or two, and at such dispersions many valuable MSS. are lost for ever. May I not express the hope that in this country, which has hitherto shown itself so generous to Jewish literature, which has saved the libraries of Oppenheim, Michael, and Almanzi from dispersion—that in this country also the Halberstam collection will find a saviour who will preserve it to posterity. I do not in the least grudge Halberstam his treasures, but I think that he will agree with me that the cause of Jewish literature, which he has so much at heart, will be best served when his MSS. follow the way of all the great Jewish collections, which have found their last home in England. Dr. Müller's Introduction to the Responsa of the Geonim [1] might, on account of the bibliographical account it gives of the various collections of these Responsa, also be placed here. It is an admirable piece of work. Indeed, it previously seemed as if every newly discovered collection only added to the difficulties of the student of the period of the Geonim. For these collections, made at different ages, in various countries, without the least regard to each other, and even without much needed discretion, often repeat themselves, and are full of interpolations, in which the Mystics had also their share. On the other hand, there are many Responsa without headings; others, again, bear false ascriptions. It is by this work of Dr. Müller that we shall be able to examine critically the productions of the Geonim, which consist mostly in ritual decisions. It not only contains a detailed account of every collection, where every heading is closely investigated, but also a complete index of the Responsa (including those which are scattered over the works of the earlier authorities, *Rishonim*) of each Gaon, from R. Mari down to R. Hai, the last of the Geonim. And what is more is that this index is quite readable, giving the essence of all the Responsa attributed

[1] מפתח לתשובת הגאונים, *Einleitung in die Responsen Babylonischer Geonim*, von Joel Müller. H. Engel. Berlin: 1891.

to each Gaon, arranged in subjects, mostly after the system accepted by Maimonides in the Mishnah Torah. To this are added the Miscellanea, containing many interesting historical and philological items (see pp. 72, 92, 100, 103, 168, 205, 254, 265) which would be worthy of being collected and edited by themselves. I may remark here that the list of the MSS. of the British Museum has also a collection of the תשובת הגאונים (Add. 27,181, compare Halberstam, Introduction to the *Sefer Yetsirah*, p. xxi.), which might now, with the help of this introduction, easily be examined, so as to ascertain whether it contains inedited matter.

Bibliography and Biography bring us to *History*. In this country we have Dr. Neubauer's contribution, *Notes on the Jews in Oxford*,[1] which, in spite of its modest title, exhausts the subject in all its parts, there being no document or important note relating to the history of the Jews in this University town which Dr. Neubauer does not print or allude to. Especially grateful the student will feel for the new edition of the eighth volume of Professor Graetz's *History*[2] with corrections and additions in which the latest discoveries of Spanish scholars, of Dr. Neubauer, Halberstam, M. Lob, and others, have been utilised. One feels the more grateful for it as this part of Graetz's work deals with the period in which the great expulsions of the Jews from Spain, Portugal, and many cities in Germany, took place. Of books dealing with the earlier history of the Jews I have to mention here: Dr. Kaminka's *Studies on the History of Galilee*.[3] A critical history of the Jews in Galilee would, indeed, be an object of interest to the Jewish as well as to the Christian student. But Dr. Kaminka is certainly not the man to do it, as far as I can judge from

[1] Published in the *Collectanea*, vol. ii. of the Oxford Historical Society, 1890.

[2] *Geschichte der Juden*, VIII. Dritte verbesserte und stark vermehrte Auflage. Leipzig: 1890.—I received this work at the very moment when this article had to be sent to press, otherwise I should have treated it with the fulness that a work by the father of Jewish history deserves.

[3] *Studien zur Geschichte Galiläas*, von Dr. Kaminka. Berlin: 1889. Verlag von Hermann Engel.

this pamphlet. His objections to the general assumption that Tiberias was avoided by noble Jewish families on account of uncleanliness caused by the lost graves in it are weak, and remind one of the ויש לדחוק ולהקשות; his emendation (p. 24) of the word יבדא in the Jerushalmi into יברח is doubtful (see Levy, s.v. יבד), whilst the preference given by him to the Hebrew version (with regard to the story that R. Simon ben Jochai declared Tiberias to be clean) in Midrash Tehillim over the other six, because they are in Aramaic, is against the acknowledged critical rule that in such cases the claim for higher antiquity rests with the Aramaic versions, Aramaic having been the popular language in which the story was told. For the Hebrew version is to be regarded only as a translation from the original, and thus belonging to a later date. He commits also a bad blunder in referring, in hi sketch of R. Simon ben Jochai, to *Aboth* ii. 9 (p. 50), the R. Simon mentioned there being ר"ש בן נתנאל, the disciple of R. Jochanan ben Zakkai. More satisfactory is Dr. Rosenzweig's essay on *Jerusalem and Cæsarea.*[1] The author does not presume to advance new theories (excepting, perhaps, note 2, p. 16, about the genealogy of Paul), but puts together the passages in the Rabbinic literature relating to the antagonism between these two cities representing Judaism and heathenism, or Christianity at a later period. Perhaps I may also record here the third volume of Mr. Luncz's annual *Jerusalem*,[2] dealing with the history of the Holy Land, and chiefly with that of Jerusalem in ancient and modern times. It contains among other excellent matter a bibliographical account of works on the geography of Palestine by Dr. Steinschneider, an essay on the topography of Sodom and Gomorrah, according to Rabbinical sources by Lector Friedmann—a series of letters written by different Rabbis living in Jerusalem, dating from before the end of the seventeenth century, and edited from MSS. by Professor

[1] *Jerusalem und Cæsarea*, von Dr. Rosenzweig. Berlin: Mayer and Müller, 1890.

[2] ירושלים *Jerusalem Jahrbuch*, III. Jahrgang. Herausgegeben von A M. Luncz. Jerusalem: 1889.

Kaufmann, and, lastly, etymological researches on the names of various cities (Jerusalem, Jericho, etc., etc.), contributed by M. Joseph Halevy, of Paris. I have no doubt that the number will be found very instructive, and the editor deserves special gratitude and support from this country, where the interest in everything touching the Holy Land is so great. The following two books, *Matamim*,[1] by an anonymous writer, and *Tekanoth*, etc., by Herr Schück,[2] on Minhagim (religious usages and customs) ought to have some bearing on history by which alone Minhagim can be explained, but they have not. Of the former, who supplies us with 1,300 explanations of various Minhagim, suffice it to say that his work was suggested to him by passages in the לב העברי, and thus belongs to a school in which anything approaching to a knowledge of history (or anything worth knowing) is considered as a mortal sin. It requires only a glance at the book to see that the author remained true to the principle of his school. Some attempt at history is, indeed, made by Herr Schück, but he still belongs to the pre-scientific era. He takes, for instance, infinite trouble to reconcile the legend that Joshua composed the prayer עלינו with another story which attributes it to R. Jochanan ben Zakkai (p. 37*a*), but it never occurs to him to question the authenticity of these legends. At another place (8*b*) he tries to explain the institution of reading the 93rd Psalm every Friday by reason of modern discoveries in geology. Herr Schück is rather afraid that his critical views will be resented by certain hyper-orthodox people in his country. This would be, indeed, a gross injustice. Lastly, I have to notice here Dr. Lazarus' essay on the *Princes of the Captivity* in Babylon,[3] whose history has remained rather obscure till now. The last writer on the subject was the late Abraham Krochmal in his *Scholien*, which is full

[1] ספר מטעמים. Anonymous. Warsaw: 1890.

[2] תקנות ותפילות, *die Kirchlichen und bürgerlichen Gesetze des Judenthums vom Jahre* 2449 *bis* 5631, etc., von Salomon Schück. Muncacs: 1890.

[3] *Die Häupter der Vertriebenen*, etc. Von Dr. Felix Lazarus, published in volume x. of Dr. Brüll's Jahrbücher, occupying the whole of this number.

of the deepest researches and most ingenious remarks on this point, and to which Dr. Lazarus owes, I am inclined to think, a great deal. But Dr. Lazarus has the advantage of having made use of various MSS. of the text of the Small Chronicle (*Seder Olam Zuta*), the chief source for the succession of those princes, but previously known only in a very corrupt form. Dr. Lazarus now gives us, in an appendix, for the first time, a critical version of this chronicle, after MSS. and rare editions, and this enables him to elucidate many obscure points in the chronology of this part of Jewish history. It is not the place, in a general review to enter into a discussion of the details, which are of a most complicated nature, and I shall only remark that the obscure *formula* of which Dr. Lazarus speaks on p. 97, will be clear enough if he had read correctly בִּתְיָה (not בִּתְיָה) as the name of the daughter of Pharaoh (1 Chron. iv. 18), who, according to the Hagadah (*Megillah*, 13*a*, and elsewhere) saved Moses from the river, and brought him up, on which account he was considered as her son.

The study of *Jewish Philosophy* is represented this year by the following works: First, Dr. Spiegler's *History of the Philosophy of Judaism.*[1] But in spite of this promising title, I need not dwell long on it. Its worthlessness will be sufficiently indicated when I point out the fact that the greatest part of the work is taken up with the Zohar, which Dr. Spiegler thinks was composed by R. Simon ben Jochai and his school (p. 135). The golden age of the Cabbalah falls, according to the author, in the first century A.C., and R. Jochanan ben Zakkai and his school, especially R. Eliezer ben Hyrkanos, the author of the *Pirke drabi Eliezer* (*sic*), and Akilas, the author of our *Targum Onkelos*, are its greatest representatives (p. 140). The description the author gives us of Maimonides' philosophy, does not show any sign that he ever studied Prof. Kaufmann's *Attributenlehre*, or his work could not be so utterly empty and superficial. Of quite another stamp is Dr. Hœnig's

[1] *Geschichte der Philosophie des Judenthums.* Von Dr. Julius Spiegler. Leipzig: Verlag von Wilhelm Friedrich, 1890.

treatise on the Ophites[1], in which he tries to prove that Gnosticism is a Jewish production, and that this and the Ophites, the first Gnostic sect, represent accordingly a Jewish heresy. There are many ingenious points in this *brochure*, and the identification of the obscure term אפטוניות in *Midrash Koheleth* i. 8 with the Greek Ὀφίτης (p. 79) is worth noticing. But, on the other hand, the author has brought forward little evidence to establish the early origin of the Gnosis among the Jews, which is the chief point in his book. All the passages he quotes from Rabbinic literature were used by Graetz, Krochmal and others to prove that during the second century Gnostic views found their way into Judaism. Nor will many agree with the author, that the theory of the *Demiurge* could only arise among the Jews (p. 68). It is true that the old question, *Unde Malum*, forces itself on every mind, but it does not follow that the Jews would have answered it through the manufacture of a demi-god. Untouched by foreign influence, the answer of the Jewish mind, with its quick transitions from reason to emotion, and its commutations of both, would probably have resulted in a fervid prayer or in entire resignation to the will of God like the Hebrew prophets and psalmists of old, when they complained of the sufferings of the righteous. The quotations the author gives from the chapter of R. Eliezer are especially unfortunate, as this book dates from a very late period, and contains already Christian elements, as has only recently been proved by M. Israel Levi (see *Revue des Études Juives*). By the way, has Dr. Hœnig seen the late Bishop Lightfoot's "Essay on the Colossian Heresy," in his *Commentary to the Epistles of St. Paul* (Volume III., page 73, *seq.*)? Dr. Goitein's pamphlet on *Optimism and Pessimism in the Philosophy of Judaism*[2] is also worth reading. The various Theodicies, from the oldest times up to Maimonides, which the author puts together, deserve careful study, though the conclusion of the author with

[1] *Die Ophiten, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des jüdischen Gnosticismus*, von Dr. Adolf Hönig. Berlin: Mayer and Müller. 1889.

[2] *Der Optimismus und der Pessimismus in der judischen Religionsphilosophie*, von Dr. H. Goitein. Berlin: Mayer and Müller. 1890.

regard to the final influence of these two conflicting views on Judaism may be contested. A lecture by Dr. Schweinburg on "Jewish Pessimists"[1] may be regarded as a supplement to the preceding work. Whether every Jewish scholar who had a fit of depression and wrote in a pessimistic vein must be looked upon as a predecessor of Schopenhauer, is a question not permitting of closer examination in the presence of the fact that the latter philosopher is now the most fashionable thinker in Germany. Of a rather theosophic character is the lately edited correspondence of R. Jonathan Eibeschütz, from a MS. in the library of Dr. Jellinek.[2] The attempts of R. Jonathan to rationalise the Cabbalah, and to reconcile it with philosophy (p. 88), are not uninteresting. The old dispute among the Cabbalists, whether the Sephiroth are to be regarded as an integral part of the Deity, or only as an emanation, turns up here again. Perhaps this correspondence, when entirely published, will throw some light on the well-known controversy between the author and R. Jacob Emden. I may also in this section include Dr. L. Grossmann's book on *Judaism and the Science of Religion*,[3] which is written in a style worthy of the subject, and indicates an honest desire on the part of the author to be just to all. I am only afraid that he is too hasty in his application of general theories, or he would scarcely detect in such passages as "the Fathers are the Merkabah" a reminiscence of sun worship (p. 174). What Dr. Grossmann means by the reference to *Tossefta Yoma*, II. *b*, I am unable to understand. Are we really to suppose that every ancient Jew who looked at a sun-dial to see the time of day, or basked in the sunshine, is to be suspected of sun-worship? The well-known passage, "The Law is like two paths," etc., which, as it would seem, he attributes (in p. 176) to R. Akiba, is known to me only as anonymous. (Cp. *Jerushalmi Chagigah*, ii. 1,

[1] *Jüdische Pessimisten*, von S. Schweinburg. Verlag D. Lowy (Vienna).

[2] שם עולם כולל אגרות ותשובות לר׳ יונתן אייבשיטץ בחקירה אלהית. Wien: 1891.

[3] *Some Chapters on Judaism and the Science of Religion*, by Rabbi Luis Grossmann. New York and London: Putnam's. 1889.

and parallels on the margin.) Of a more satisfactory character in my judgment is Dr. Grossmann's *Lecture on Maimonides*, [1]which is a very fair and sympathetic appreciation of this great Jewish thinker.

In the region of *General Literature* I have only to record two books, both excellently done. Of Mr. Joseph Jacobs' admirable *Introduction to the Fables of Æsop*,[2] the results, as regards the part played by Judaism in preserving these fables, have been already noticed in this REVIEW. The second part of Herr Philipp's classical edition of *Jewish Poetry in the Middle Ages*[3] fully bears out the high reputation the author has acquired by his previous productions. From a prospectus I have lately received from Herr Philipp, I learn that he intends to continue editing the Divan of R. Jehudah Hallevi, and other poetical pieces which he copied last summer in the Bodleian in Oxford. It is to be hoped that he may succeed in this important undertaking. I may also express the wish that Herr Philipp will be a little more concise in his notes. There is hardly any need, for instance, to illustrate the sayings of the Gaon by passages in the Sanscrit literature. Dr. Rubin brings us this year a treatise on the origin of arts and sciences in the prehistoric ages,[4] which, like most of his other works, will prove very useful to those who are incapable of reading any other language except Hebrew. Of Dr. Maybaum's masterly treatise on Jewish Homiletics,[5] it is only necessary here to mention the title, as its merits have already been ably brought before the readers of this REVIEW.

The want of special works might, perhaps, be compensated for by the various *Miscellanea*, of which we have a great abundance. Paramount among them is the *Jubelschrift*,[6]

---

[1] *Maimonides: a Paper.* By Rabbi L. Grossmann. Putnam, 1890.

[2] *The Fables of Æsop*, now again edited by and induced by Joseph Jacobs. London: 1889. (D. Nutt.)

[3] בית הבחירה ח"ב • כולל כל שירי רב האי גאון, Krakau: 1889.

[4] עין הדעת, Dr. S. Rubin. Wien: 1891.

[5] *Jüdische Homiletik.* Berlin: 1890.

[6] *Jubelschrift zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, des Dr. Hildesheimer. Berlin: H. Engel, 1890.

containing a collection of essays by various scholars, dedicated to Dr. J. Hildesheimer on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. It opens with an exegetical study of Isaiah lxvi., by Dr. Feilchenfeld, Chief Rabbi of Posen, well known for many excellent essays on the Bible. I am afraid, however, that in this particular matter he has not been quite happy in his hypothesis. According to the author, Isaiah lxvi. forms a protest against a certain Jewish rationalistic sect, who, in their universalistic notions of the Jewish religion, for which they thought they found support in the older prophecies, refused to return to Jerusalem, pleaded for amalgamation with their heathen surroundings as a means of facilitating their missionary work to the Gentile world, and as the result of borrowing certain enlightened views from the Medo-Persic religion, protested against sacrificial worship. This view is in the main not entirely new (see Dillmann's *Isaiah*, p. 535). Considering that Isaiah lxvi., according to the opinions of most modern commentators, dates from about the end of the sixth century, it is not altogether impossible that the prophet's words were directed against a certain section of the Jews, who, lacking in patriotism, did not care much for the restoration of Jerusalem, preferring to have the temple built in Babylon. On the other hand, the views which Dr. Feilchenfeld attributes to this section are too rational for the time, and strongly recall the doctrines of Jewish sects at a very late period, whilst his exegesis is far-fetched. (See, for instance, his explanation of the word הֲאִם, "Is it not, indeed?") But what makes matters worse is that Dr. Feilchenfeld assures us that his exposition is entirely independent of the question with regard to the age of the prophet (p. 9, note 1). Dr. Feilchenfeld is very successful in his explanation of the obscure passage in Tractate Sabbath, 67*b* (p. 23). Quite worthy of his position and his fame is the article contributed by Dr. Rosenthal, Rabbi at Breslau, on the Institutions תקנות of R. Gershon, the light of the Exile, the most important of which is the ordinance forbidding polygamy. As with everything coming to us from this remote period (the tenth century), the documents of these *Tekanoth* are in a most

corrupt state, and exist in different versions. Dr. Rosenthal tries to restore the original text, as well as to establish its authenticity by the use of MSS. and quotations in various Rabbinical words. Secular history, so far as it has any relation to these institutions, is also laid under contribution by the learned author. To judge from the heading of this essay, *Einiges über die*, etc., it would seem that Dr. Rosenthal intends to publish one day a larger treatise on this interesting subject. Perhaps he might then be able also to employ the MSS. in the British Museum, Or. 1989 (p. 91*b*. *seq.*), and Or. 1083 (26*b*), both of them containing versions of the תקנות דרי גרשום, the former of which would, we think, prove of special value (see *Monatsschrift*, 1855, p. 104 about this MS.) The Machsor Vitri in the same library (Add. 27,200, page 152*b*) contains also a paragraph תקנות הקהל, which might, I believe, throw some light on the subject. The group of *Tekanoth*, beginning with צין המטה, has also been published by Dr. Neubauer, from various MSS. in the *Revue des Études Juives*, No. XXXIII., p. 69 *seq.* Dr. M. Horovitz, one of the Rabbis in Frankfurt-on-the-Main, contributes a *Responsum* as to the validity of marriage in a certain given case. There is nothing fresh about it, either as regards method or line of argument. The only new feature is, perhaps, the fact that it is written in German, whilst any Polish or Russian Rabbi would have answered in Hebrew. I cannot deny that I prefer שו"ת in Hebrew, when written in a good rabbinical style. Dr. Munk, of Marburg, gives a very interesting essay on the constitution of the Jews in the Principality of Hesse, in Germany, as well as the Text of their *Tekanoth*. The excommunication pronounced there against dealing in false coin is worth noticing, showing that it was not only ritual matters over which the synagogue kept spiritual watch. Dr. Hofmann adorns the volume by an essay on the existence of a *Mechilta d'rabbi Ishmael on Deuteronomy*, fragments of which he discovers in the *Midrash Haggadol*. As the present writer is preparing an edition of this *Midrash*, he will soon find occasion to enlarge on the results of this admirable and thorough piece of work.

Dr. Olitzki's essay treats of the symbolical significance given by R. Abraham ben Ezra to certain numbers. The relation pointed out by the author between the symbolism of Aben Ezra and those of certain Greek as well as Jewish mystical schools, is not without interest. Dr. Friedlander and Dr. Bennet contribute new Hebrew translations from certain parts of Maimonides' *Commentary to the Mishnah;* the former, of the third chapter of the tractate *Rosh Hashanah*, the latter, of the first chapter of the *Sayings of the Fathers*. Dr. Lowenstein publishes, from a Merzbach MS., seven Jewish songs, composed by various German rabbis during the fifteenth century. They are mostly of a serious character, and the fact that they were adapted to airs of Gentile songs, which do not seem to have always been of a very edifying character, would prove that John Wesley was not the first who urged the principle that the best tunes should not be left to the devil. The song against games of chance (p. 138), deserves the special attention of the student of the history of morals in the Middle Ages. Professor Barth's researches on the *Passive Qual and its Participles* will undoubtedly be found very instructive by specialists, whilst Dr. Berliner's excellent essay *From Sad Times* forms a most interesting contribution to the history of the Jews in Italy. For the דרוש להר"אש על מזלולי התורה, edited there by Herr Halberstam, from his own library, the student of Jewish theology will be very grateful, showing, as it does, the divergent opinions of the Jewish schools with regard to the position of rationalism in religion. Dr. Lerner's and Herr Hurwitz's Notes on some difficult Talmudical passages represent again in its best method that side of Jewish learning which was current a century ago.

Not less interesting, both for variety of matter and wide scholarship, are the collected essays and articles of the late Dr. Löw,[1] as well as those of the late M. Arsène Darmestetter.[2] The former may fairly be regarded as the greatest Talmudical scholar of the modern school. Though very liberally

[1] *Gesammelte Schriften von Leopold Löw.* Two vols. Szegedin: 1890. Verlag von Alexander Baba.

[2] *Reliques Scientifiques.* Paris: 1890. 2 vols.

inclined and highly accomplished in every branch of secular learning, he shows an acquaintance with the Possekin literature which would have been admired even in a Rabbi of the seventeenth century. This may be seen from his works "Lebensalter," "Die Jüdische Graphic," and in the first volume of this collection, where nothing escapes him which has the remotest reference to his subject even in the most obscure Responsum or Halachic Compendium. The present volume, however, is mainly taken up with historical studies, the most important being, in my judgment, the biography of the well-known R. Aaron Chorin, which deserves to be carefully read. It is certainly written in a partial spirit, as Löw was the disciple and friend of Chorin. But this man has already suffered so much from the prejudice of the opposite side that there will be no harm done if Löw's verdict should incline us to a more favourable judgment. The mere fact that Zunz received his התרת הוראה, Rabbinical diploma, from him would serve to prove that Chorin was held in high estimation by his contemporaries. Of a more strictly scientific nature is the work of M. Darmestetter, the first volume of which is almost entirely taken up with Jewish studies. The essay, *Le Talmud*, is perhaps one of the best of the kind, whilst the *Études Judéo-Françaises* contains an inexhaustible mine of philological and historical material, for which the scholarly world will feel the more grateful, seeing that the number of those who are equally familiar with the two languages is extremely small.

The new Hebrew annual, *Kenesseth Haggedolah*, edited by Herr Suvalski,[1] which is intended to become a kind of impartial periodical representing the view of all the different parties among the Jews in Russia, does not come up to the standard of such journals. I must say that I do not much care for this mixed multitude. There is much talk in it of nationality, of the importance of a national literature, of quarrels about *Shochetim* and similar topics, but very little of scientific value. The only articles worth reading

[1] כנסת הגדולה. Warsaw: 1890.

are the few notes by Reifmann, and the review by the editor himself of various books. Rather interesting is the pedigree Herr Friedstein gives us there (I., 103),—from a MS. bearing the signature of R. David, the son of the well-known author of the שלשלת הקבלה—of the Yachya family, beginning with Adam and going down to this R. David. As the Yachya family believed itself to be descended from David, and this pedigree thus includes also the enumeration of the princes of the captivity, Herr Friedstein's discovery gains especial importance for the historian. Entirely new is the statement that there was a ראש גולה חייא, the first Jewish exile who emigrated to Poland. It would be desirable if Herr Friedstein would give a fuller description of the MS. to which we are indebted for this information, there being indeed many reasons for suspecting this document (see the above-mentioned work by his father, pp. 29*a*, 53*b*). Much better is the *Haasif*, of which we now have the fifth volume,[1] containing historical articles by Weiss on Nachmanides, by Kaufmann on R. Sabbathai, Sopher of Premiszel, and by Oppenheim on the *Tendency of the Aggadoth*.

That indefatigable critic, Schorr, is still working. There is, indeed, much in the last number of his *Hechaluz*[2] which comes too late—a review of R. Z. Fränkel's *Mebo Hayerushalmi*, which appeared in 1870; but he gives also fresh matter on works published lately, as the *Halachoth Gedoloth* and the *Responsa of the Geonim*, whilst the lamentation on p. 109, which he publishes from a MS., offers a new document on the sad history of the *auto-da-fés* through which the Talmud has had to pass. Some important pieces will also be found in the last volume of the *Ozar Hassifruth*, edited by Herr Gräber.[3] For the republication of the ספר הפרדס, by R. Yedayah of Bedres, with supplements by Herr Halberstam, a work which was as rare as a manuscript, the editor deserves

[1] האסיף, by N. Sokolow. Warsaw: 1887. Weiss' article originally appeared in this REVIEW (I. 289 seq.).

[2] החלוץ, XIII., by H. Osias Schorr. Wien: 1889.

[3] אוצר הספרות, III.; 1889-90.

the special gratitude of the literary world. I understand that the next volume of the *Rabbins Français*, now passing through the press, will also treat of R. Yedayah's life and his works, and give a full description of the Pardes in its different versions. Professor Kaufmann again continues the publication of the minute-books in many Jewish communities, which render very valuable materials to Jewish history. This is also the case with the צוק העתים, an account by an eye-witness of the Chmelnizki persecution, which was prepared for the new edition by the late Dr. Gurland. And lastly I recommend Dr. Oppenheim's *Essay on Jewish Apostasy and its Causes* to the attention of all Jewish ministers. They cannot fail to profit by reading it.

S. SCHECHTER.

POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE the foregoing was written the fifth part of Herr Horovitz's collection תוספתא עתיקתא has appeared, containing the ברייתא דמסכת נדה from a MS. in the library of Herr Halberstam. It is to be noticed that it is only a fragment, for the end of the Boraitha breaks off in the middle of a sentence. Now, I have already alluded to the fourth part of this collection פתחי נדה, which forms an introduction to the part which has now followed. But we miss there the name of Schorr, the editor of the Hechaluz, who was the first, I think, to draw the attention of students to the quotation from this Boraitha, as well as to throw some light on its exotic nature. Indeed, with all his diligence, Herr Horovitz was hardly able to add a single name to the list of the authorities who really saw this Boraitha, as given by Schorr in the *Hechaluz*, vol. VIII., page 50 (see also p. 160, the quotations from Nachmanides' *Derashah*), and Brüll in his *Jahrbücher* II., page 126. All the other writers we meet in Herr Horovitz's notes knew it only at second and third hand. I am also inclined to agree with Schorr, who, when the first chapter of this Boraitha was published in 1882 by Herr Horovitz, in his collection בית נכות, etc. (II., p. 24), declared it to be משובישים ומזויפים (*Hechaluz* XII., p. 100) *corrupt and forged.* A

similar verdict was given by Brüll (*ib.* 159). It is true that it contains certain passages with regard to the isolation of the Niddah which might have some claim to a higher antiquity when authorities were still more stringent in this respect (see *Sabbath*, 64*b*), but on the whole it makes the impression of a manufactured imitation of the *Tossephta* about the Geonaic period, when so many other pieces were forged. The attribution of the first Halachah to שמאי shows the desire of the author to imitate the existing tractate "Niddah," which begins with the words שמאי אומר. In the name of R. Eleazar ben Arach various Halachoth are given, whilst, except the saying in *Aboth* II. 12, and the fact that he was the disciple of R. Jochanan ben Zakkai, and afterwards neglected his study, the older Rabbinic literature knows nothing about him, and neither the *Talmud* nor the *Midrashim* contain a single sentence from him. It is only on the pseudo-epigraphic chapters of R. Eliezer that his name appears again. R. Chanina ben Dossa, who is more known as a saint than as a Halachic teacher, we also meet in this Boraitha (p. 11); but it is a bad anachronism to represent him putting a question to R. Chiya, who lived more than a century later. This reminds one of the anachronism in the before-mentioned chapters of R. Eliezer, in which Ben Azai gives an account of the life of R. Simon ben Lakish (ch. xliii.). The story on p. 6 about the death of the son of R. Abuha has about it an air of solemn mockery, which one meets occasionally in the Zohar. R. Nechunyah ben Hakanah, of whom a long story is given on p. 86, is also the hero of later forgeries as the Bahir. The denominative שנתנרת, or the verb קישו (p. 27) are strange to the Talmudic literature, which has instead of the former ראתה דם, and of the latter שאלו, except, perhaps, once in Genesis Rabba xxxv. § 3, in the way of a pun. The passage יצתה בת קול ואמרה ··· אלו ואלו דברי אלהים חיים אבל הלכה כדברי ב"ש looks like a parody of the story in Erubin 13*b*. But the preference given to the school of Shammai strengthens the suspicion of its Karaitic tendency, which also other passages suggest.

However, even if this Boraitha dates only from the Geonaic period, it is still old enough to be regarded as an

important contribution to ancient Jewish literature. Then, too, its very exotic nature makes it interesting enough to deserve a thorough study. Herr Horovitz himself felt that he was not always successful in his commentary. Indeed, it would seem that the sources of this Boraitha have rather to be sought in Karaitic and Samaritan writers than among the Rabbis. The following few extracts from MSS. might, however, prove not to be altogether useless to the student. I give first an extract from a MS. in the British Museum, Add. 27,129 (p. 131*b*), which bears the heading פרק נדה containing the greater part of פרק א' הלכה א', ב' וה', and פרק ב הלכה ד, but offers some different readings. On this follow the הלכות נדה as they are to be found in the לקוטי הפרדם לרש"י, and the דין יצירת הולד, concluding with the words סליק להו פרק נדה שבח לאל רם ונישא.

בית שמאי אומר גדולה היא הנדה שהיא מרחקת מן העבירה ומקרבת לגן עדן ולא עוד שהיא מרחקת מן הטומאה ומקרבתן לטהרה ואיזו היא המקרבת לטהרה האשה כשהיא מזהרת בעצמה · אימתי בזמן שהיא טובלת · אמר ר' חנינה בזמן שהיא טובלת חזרה ופגעה בכלב אם היתה חכמה ויש בה יראת שמים לא תניח לבעלה לשמש עמה באותה הלילה למה שלא יעמדו בניה מכוערין ופניהם דומין לכלב עד שתחזור ותטבול שניה · ואי טבלה ופגעה בחמור אין לה רשות לבוא עם בעלה למה שלא תקריב עצמה לעבירה ויעמדו בניה לבם טפש כלב החמור ותטבול שלישית ואפי' כשחזרה ופגעה בעם הארץ אסור לה לשמש עם בעלה עד שתחזור ותטבול חזרה ופגעה תעלה ותשמש · אלה הם שבניהן דומין לכלב ההולכין בשוק ואוכלין והרוק שלהן יורד על הזקן שלו ולשונו נפסק מלדבר אם ראית איש שהוא במדה זו דע שבשעה שטבלה אמו חזרה ופגעה בכלב · ואלה הן שדומין לחמור לבן טפש ואינן לומדין תורה מכוערין בהליכתן והדבבים מתקבצים על פניהם ואם ראית אדם במדה זו דע שבשעה שטבלה אמו חזרה ופגעה בחמור · ואלו הן שבניהם דומים לעמי הארץ מדברין ואינן נאים בדיבורן לומדין ומשכחין מהלכים בשוק והבריות משחקין בה אם ראית אדם במדה זו דע שבשעה שטבלה אמו חזרה ופגעה בעם הארץ · א"ר חייא אשריו ואשרי אביו ואשרי אמו שאמו טבלה ופגעת בסוס בשעת הטבילה בניה נאים בהליכתן נאים בעמידתן נאים בדיבורן שומעין ומבינים למדין תורה ומשנה ולא עוד אלא שאימתן על הבריות · אם ראית אדם שהוא תם בדרכיו ומשפיל קומתו ומדבר ודבריו נשמעין במהרה דע שבשעה שטבלה אמו פגעה בסוס ואם ראית אדם שהוא מחליף את לשונו מהפך את

ידיו לידיו דע שבשעה ששימש אביו עם אמו ונשקה היה הרוק יוצא מפיו : אלו הן שקוברות את בעליהן כל מי שאינה מזדהרת בנדתה וכמה תשמור כל ימי נדתה ר' עקיבא אומר שבעת ימים · אם כבסה בגדיה בשביעי וראתה טפה כחרדל בשמיני חוזרת ומכבסת בתשיעי ואם ראתה לאחר כביסה בעשירית חוזרת ומשמרת אחת עשר אם ראת באחד עשר טפה כחרדל משמרת שנים עשר : רבן יוחנן בן זכאי אומר אילו' ראתה למאה ימים משמרת שבעה נקיים · המשמרת ימי את נדתה לא תבשל לבעלה ולא אופה ולא מרקדת ולא תפרוש את המטה ולא תשקה מים ולא מפנה מים מכלי חרש מפני שהיא מטמאה כל צורך : אמר ר' חנינא אפילו הרוק של נדה שהיא רוקקת על גבי המטה ודרסו בעלה או בניה נטמאין בכל צורך ואסורין להכנס בביה הכנסת עד שיטבילו את עצמן במים למה שהרוק בנדה ואמרו חכמים המשמשת את בעלה והיא נדה גורמת לבעלה שלא ינחלו תורה אפילו לעשרים דור בני בניה לוקין בצרעת · האיש אינו רשאי לשמש את אשתו לא לפני השמש ולא לפני הירח ולא לפני הכוכבים : כנגד השמש למה אם תתעבר באותו היום ויצאו בניה ביד אחד ולא עוד אלא שהיא גורמת לו ומלבישתו לבן ואיזהו לבן זה הבהר כנגד מאורו · ושל ירח למה שמא תתעבר ותלד סוף בניה לוקין בבהק ואל תאמר שסוף הבהק לצרעת נהפך · לפני הכוכבים למה שמא תתעבר ותלד ויצאו בניה מלגלגים בלשונם ולא עוד אלא שהיא גורמת לו ללקות ברוח · ולמה הולד יוצא ממעי אמו והוא אלם אלא כשנגע בה בעלה היתה מדברת ומחשבת באיש אחר · האשה ששמשה עם בעלה וראת דם ולא הכיר עד שתי שעות ביום האיך יבדוק מניח ירק בתוך המים והיא משטפת את ידיה אם יצאו המים מכוערין מטיפין עליהן שלש טיפין יין ומשקין את האשה אם יוצא ממנה זרע מרובה בלילה ראת ואם לא ביום ראת האשה שגבר עליה זובה מה עושין לה שיפסוק הדם מביאין לה מימי גרגיר ומימי כרפס ושולקין למעלה מן האש ונותנין לתוכו זפת עד שתשים באש ואח"כ מביאין לו לבונה זכה ומשליכין לתוך המים ומשקין אותו לאשה מיד הדם נפסק ואמרו האשה האשה כשהיא נדה לא תקציץ צפורניה שמא יפול אחד מהם לארץ וידרוס בו אדם וסופו ללקות בשחין והעון בצווארה · א"ר יודן אסור לברך לפני הנדה שלא תהרהר ותאמר אמן · ונתחלל השם ואסור שאול בשלומה של נדה שמא החזור ויתחלל המקום · ר' נחמיה אומר אפילו הדיבור שיוצא מפיה טמא · א"ר יוחנן אסור אדם לילך אחר הנידה ולדרוס את אפרה שהוא טמא כמת כן עפרה של נדה טמא ואסור ליהנות ממעשי ידיה :

MS. Or. 1389 (p. 76), which I have already mentioned, contains also a large quotation from this פרק. In the passage

ואוכלים כשור ואינם יודעים it adds ואלו שבניהם דומים לעם הארץ להבין בין טוב לרע. In another MS. in the same library, I find the following quotation from *Midrash* (חדישה ?) which might, perhaps, have proved the conclusion of this Boraitha ולמה נזר יולדת זכר ז' ויולדת נקבה י"ד דברי ימים כדי להזכיר אדם הראשון שנברא בו (?י) ימים והיה בשבת נוצר אדם שהוא יום ח' לכך טהרתן של זכר לאחר ז' ימים שיהיה יום שבת מטהרו שהוא ראיית פני מטרונא אך יצירת חוה לא היתה בשבת ראשונה עד שבת שנייה שהוא לאחר י"ד דברי ר' פנחס בן יאיר אבל חכמים אומרים שניהם נבראו ביום ו' וכו' From Oxford MSS. I may, perhaps, give here a quotation from Cod. 692 (Catalogue Neubauer), 137a, which has some relation to the subject.

כתוב בספר המקצועו' דרבי' חננאל סמך למניקה ולמעוברת שלא תינשא עד כ"ד חודש שני' לא תבשל גדי מנין תִּבָּשֵׁל בגימטריא כ"ד חודש חמר של ל"ל יום ובית ימים יתרין אחד ליום שנולד בו ואחד ליום שנתקדשה בו וכן מצאתי אני הכותב תשובה גאון וכתוב בה עוד ותני ר' חייא לא תסיג גבול עולם זו מעוברת חבירו ובשדה יתומים אל תבא זו מינקת מכתיבת ידו של רבי' אפרים מבונא העתקתיו :

Of more importance, however, is the following extract from Cod. 1101 (Catalogue Neubauer), fol. 209*a*, which is given in רוקח סימן שי"ח, with some variations in the name of the מעשה הגאונים :

(209*a*. מרב סעדיה גאון ' המשמשת נדה לבעלה גורמת אפילו לכ' דורות שבוה לוקין בצרעת לא מפנה מים מן הכד ושותה אלא יהיה לה כלי לנידותה ולא תקציץ צפרניה פן ידרסו עליהן בעלה או אחרים וילקו בשחין ' ר' אלעזר בן ערך אומר כשאיש משמש עם אשתו בליצנות ובניבול פה הק"בה אומר למלאך ולוקח דם נידותה ונותנה לתוך פיה ומיד לוקה הולד ' הנידה אין לה רשות לישב על השולחן ואסור למלאות את הכוס ולהשקותה בו מפני שהיא טמאה ' אמר ר' חלפתא אשריה ואשרי יולדתה המשמרת את בעלה מדינה של גיהנם ומביאתו לחיי עולם הבא : מעשה בתלמיד אחד שמרת ולא הלכו בני אדם אחר מטתו התחילו חביריו לבכותו ואמרו זו תורה וזו שכרה פקח הק"בה עיניו בחלומו ואמ' לו חבירך לא עבר עבירה מימיו כי אם פעם אחת עברה אשתו נידה ונגעה בבגדיו לכך תגבו העבירה ממנו ' בלילה ראו חביריו מהלך בתוך הפרדס בתוך עיינות מים בגן עדן :

S. S.